DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 364 64 IR 000 852

AUTHOR Stotler, Donald W.
TITLE National Demonstration Center for Self-Learning and Community Involvement. FY 1973-74, Final Report.
INSTITUTION Portland State Univ., Oreg. Environmental Education Center.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 74
GRANT OEG-0-73-5417
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Annual Reports; *Community Involvement; *Demonstration Programs; *Environmental Education; Independent Study; Instructional Materials Centers
IDENTIFIERS Environmental Education Center; *Portland State University

ABSTRACT

Four appendixes are used to describe the activities and purposes of Environmental Education Center at Portland State University. The first appendix is an excerpt from a recent proposal and describes the philosophy and general goals of the center. The activities of the center have aimed at development and demonstration of a self-learning and community involvement center and Eco-net communications network model which would best facilitate environmental education. The second appendix is a draft which continues the discussion of the first appendix. The final report (three pages) for fiscal year 1972 is the third appendix. Finally, Appendix 4 summarizes statistics on public use of the Environmental Education Center site and services. (WH)

ED 093364

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Final Report FY 1973-74

# National Demonstration Center for

# Self-Learning and Community Involvement

OEG - 073 - 5417

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Environmental Education Center
373 Lincoln Hall
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207
503-229-4682

Donald Stotler, Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

R000 852

OEC-073-5417

The Environmental Education Center philosophy and general goals are described in an exerpt from a recent Environmental Education Center proposal. (See Appendix 1.) The Environmental Education Center activities have aimed at development and demonstration of a self-learning and community involvement center and Eco-net communication network model which we feel would best facilitate environmental education. Appendix 2 is a draft providing additional rational and description of the center-communication network approach to educational or learning structure. Even though, during the past year, project emphasis has changed from building to to refining and maintaining an environmental education center and from initiating a local Eco-net to expanding and deepening local ties and developing a regional and national Eco-net, comments in the 1972-73 final report on goals, project design, resources, coordination, and evaluation are relevent. (See Appendix 3) Quarterly reports from December, 1973, and March, 1974 detail project activities, success, and problems during the first three-quarters of the year. During the fourth quarter, as in previous quarters, efforts lay in the following seven major areas:

-assistance to programs involving citizens in decision-making and facilitating people-to-people information exchange such as Bend in the River environmental media referendum, SYNCON Energy and the Future of Society conference, Expo 74 symposia series, etc.

-development of student-community projects involving consortia of school districts, universities, regulatory agencies, and industry in environmental quality monitoring.

-initiation of and coordination of student and volunteer development of new environmental lab space, equipment, and activities and information files.

-participation in and assistance to existing committees, organizations and institutions with environmental education-related projects (see previous reports for specific groups.)

-use of and experimentation with various media such as donated Tektronix graphics terminal, public access cable, 1/2" portapak video, specialized and genral newsletters and announcements, ad hoc brainstorming and information-sharing meetings, etc.

-exploration of different student-volunteer and intern program structures.

-maintenance of current Environmental Education Center facilities and services.

-encouragement and assistance to groups and individuals planning or building community environmental centers, including Expo-Spokane environmental center, OMSI energy center, various school district learning centers.

Because of additional USOE funding available during FY 74-75, the Environmental Education Center will be able to develop and disseminate information which will describe and demonstrate Environmental Education Center philosophy, strategies, techniques and activities. This information will complete this final report.

Finally, Appendix 4 summarizes statistics on public use of Environmental Education Center site and services.

During the past three years of environmental education effort, the Environmental Education Center at Portland State University has gained a reputation throughout the region as both a physical and spiritual center for the environmental education movement in the Northwest. The EEC began its work as clearinghouse for environmental education information and activities in the Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas County areas of Oregon. Soon, however, as a range of community groups became involved in the physical development of the Center and in the gathering and disseminating of environmental information. The EEC began to take a more active role in facilitating local environmental education. Last year with the support of its individual and group users, its local, state, and regional advisory groups, the EEC submitted a proposal to the Environmental Education Act which recognized the Environmental Education Center's active education role, and the unique opportunity to pursue the environmental education ideals shared by the EEC and its constiuency.

The Environmental Education Center's projects, activities, and on-going community services are aimed at working with others through a self-learning process to encourage and facilitate the community involvement which could bring about a future society in which:

1. Citizens are concerned, motivated to act on their concern, and able to effect positive change based on their concern.
2. Management and control of activities are determined on a local or regional level so that individual citizen or group input can make a difference.
3. Services are unified and centralized and thus consistantly efficient and easily accessible to the learner.

Definitions of Environmental Education distributed by the Office of Environmental Education stress interaction with the environment and learning from these interactions as the means to approach the subject matter of environment. The Environmental Education Center's experience suggests that a self-learning model is the most appropriate approach to environmental education.

Self-Learning: A Summary.

The self-learning process involves generating, exploring, and testing alternatives within the learner's physical, psychological, and socio-cultural environments. Self-learning is best facilitated when:

1. awareness of a problem or possible area of study results in
2. learner-initiated and-determined activities around the area of study
3. the learner's responsibility includes:
   - -designing
   - -executing
   - -testing and evaluating the results of his project.

A person may be involved in transactions with his environment in three ways:

1. research (creating new options)
2. education (finding and using known options)
3. recreation (diversionary experience)

The process of self-learning improves the quality and efficiency of these transactions by giving the self-learner experience in selecting the type of transaction most suitable to his needs and practice in using available resources to meet these needs. Evidence of mastering self-learning skills includes demonstrating the ability to:

1. perceive change or the necessity for it.
2. plan and effect change toward a decided goal in response to perceived needs.
3. complete a self-initiated project from awareness through evaluation of action.

The EEC's work is aimed at facilitating this education process in learners at all levels. Toward this end, the Environmental Education Center suggests that an ideal center for self-learning would:

1. be situated within approximately ten minutes travel time from community residents.
2. be open twenty-four hours per day, every day of the year.
3. provide the facilities and resources necessary to pursue self-initiated experiences.
4. provide access to resources not directly available at the local center by being part of a communications and transportation network shared with other activity and resource centers. Centers would be linked together and to their users and resources through communication modes such as video, computer terminals, WATTS lines, Xerox, written and in-person contact. Learner-to-center access would be developed through alternative transport links such as mass rapid transit, bike paths and pedestrian malls.

Each ideal center would, of necessity, participate in a multi-dimensional cooperative communications network. This contact and participation in the wider world is essential since neither environmental issues nor the resources necessary for dealing with these issues are exclusively local. Such a network of similar centers would provide access to scattered and perhaps unique resources located throughout the nation.

First Year: Progress

During the first six months of EEC existence as a National Demonstration Center for Self-learning and Community Involvement, the EEC has been working in three broad areas:

1. Development of the present EEC as a community focus for environmental concern and a community access point to environmental education resources. Activities in this area include:
   a. development of on-site displays, meeting, study, information facilities and on-site activities.
   b. involvement of community groups and students in the planning and implementation of the above.
   c. maintenance and development of phone communication and information services.
   d. active EEC staff participation in the local, state, regional and national environmental and environmental education affairs.
   e. publicity on environmental affairs and EEC services.
2. Development of Portland, Oregon, and Northwest environments as the sites and opportunities for environmental self-learning. Activities

in this area include:

a. gathering and disseminating information on existing environmental events, programs, field trips, media, etc.

b. work with other groups in the identification of local, state, and national environmental education needs.

c. work with other groups in the application of self-learning approaches to the use of environmental education resources.

3. Development of the local, state, regional, and national environmental communication network which will facilitate the flow of environmental information, ideas, and cooperative action. These activities include:

a. gathering and disseminating information on existing environmental people, projects, learning opportunities, and communication networks.

b. exploring new or alternative communication media such as computer and video.

c. participating in and sharing information through existing environmental communication networks, such as newspapers and magazines, existing environmental groups, and committee meetings.

d. assessing possible EEC participation in development of new communication media such as conference or workshop formats, alternative center or meeting formats, newsletters or resource packets, cable TV, portable video tapes, etc.

In its first six months as a national demonstration center, the Environmental Education Center has undertaken the following specific projects:

1. advised on the design and construction of the EEC's contemplation, study and small group meeting room by Portland State University students.

2. advised on the design and construction of EEC's environmental learning lab by an Explorer Architecture Group, area high school students, and volunteers.

3. advised on the curriculum for a Portland State University course, Environmental Education for Teachers.

4. maintained display and meeting facility services.

5. maintained existing information services on environmental and environmental education affairs.

6. developed and advised on volunteer development of the following new information files: Environmental Education People, Projects, and Programs in Oregon; Energy Information; Environmental Media; Community Environmental People Network; Environmental Games, Simulations, and alternate teaching strategies; Environmental Centers throughout the U.S.; Free Environmental Resources for Educators.

7. advised on the development of Northwest Regional Education Laboratory environmental learning packets for rural schools.

8. advised and participated in planning and execution of Oregon and Washington environmental educators conference at Menucha.

9. advised and assisted development of Hill Foundation-funded Eco-net video project to develop environmental video awareness and competence throughout the Northwest.

10. advised and provided extensive information for development of comprehensive EXPO Environment 74 program and Environmental Communication Cen in Spokane, Washington.

11. initiated state-wide bulletin board campaign to share environmental information among Oregon schools.

12. initiated and advised on Portland State Univsersity, Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, and Portland Public Schools consortium to develop an environmental careers program to involve students in gathering baseline environmental data for government agencies and industries.

13. planned and executed six week community seminar on the significance of the ERTS satellite to whole earth thinking, and Oregon natural resource and land use assessment.

14. advised and assisted in developing TV series on energy, land use, and the environment.

15. advised on the development of plans for four environmental centers in Portland area schools and at Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

16. published and distributed two issues of the quarterly EEC bulletin.

17. provided leadership and coordination in the continuation of the Portland Public Schools environmental education plan through initiating, coordinating and chairing environmental education meetings.

18. served on the following advisory groups with environmental relevance: State Advisory Board for Environmental Education; Creative Outlet Advisory Board, Parkrose Methodist Futures Committee; World Future Society; Tryon Creek Advisory Board; Chairman, Environmental Management Committee of the Committee of Fifty for Forest Park; Executive Committee, Stop Oregon Litter and Vandalism (SOLV); Izaak Walton League; Oregon Environmental Council; Expo Environment 74 Working Committee; Forestry Center Education Advisory Committee; Portland Zoo Education Advisory Committee and Research Advisory Committee; Zoological SocietyBoard; Oregon Museum of Science and Industry Board of Directors, Community Resource Center, and Eco-net advisory committees; Metro Environmental Education Committee; Metro Educational Coordinating Council, Alternative Education Committee; Human Resources Council; PSU PACE Board.

19. advised in the development of alternative futures curriculum with Title III Beaverton-Tigard Environmental Program.

20. sponsored and advised Explorer Group organized to monitor environmental quality in Portland's 6000 acre Forest Park.

21. participated in Consortium of Regional Environmental Education Councils meetingin Boulder, Colorado. The Environmental Education Center has been one of the two new members invited to join this national advisory group to AAAS.

22. advised on the development of a self-learning environmental education trail in Portland's Forest Park.

23. advised and provided information toward development of Environmental Protection Agency environmental curriculm packets.

24. participated with community groups in planning and development of St. Francis Neighborhood Park, information center, and summer program.

25. participated with Oregon Museum of Science and Industry in development of a state-wide program to encourage citizen ideas on the solution of environmental problems - Energy-Environmental Proposium. The EEC will serve as the resposiitory for these citizen ideas.

26. worked with Crown Zellerbach Corporation on an Environmental Education Center funding drive among business and industry in Oregon.

27. developed four resource information sheets summarizing and notify educators and citizens of EEC files available for their use. These include: Noise Pollution, Energy Information Sources, Environmental Education Center Services, and Finding and Using Environmental Education Films.

28 hired assistant to help with EEC communications with funding donated by the Hill Family Foundation.

29. began work on an invited monograph on environmental education for the Association of Supervisors and Directors of Curriculum (Oregon).

30. hosted 5,437 visitors to the EEC

31. hosted 171 groups, classes, or meetings, larger than 5 people.

32. received 2484 phone requests for information.

33. received 258 reguests for consultation on funding possibilities and proposal writing.

34. supervised 1420 hours of volunteer work.

35. assisted with the development of 28 community-EEC video projects.

36. advised on the development of 7 Environmental Education Center displays.

37. judged environmentally-oriented contests such as Clackamas Community College's Pollution Solutions, KGW's Environmental Art Contest, etc.

38. spoke at many state, national and local conferences, meetings, and seminars, including Linn-Benton Community College Man and the Land Conference, Mt. Hood Community College conference on the Energy Crisis, Oregon College of Education futures conference, Western National Association of Science Teachers Conference, various high schools, and the National Association of Science and Technology Centers Annual Meeting.

39. advised on planning of Man and the Built Environment Conference and resulting proposals for Man and the Built Environment Guide to Portland.

40. provided a display for the Portland Boat Show at the Memorial Coliseum in space donated by KGW radio station and prepared public service announcement on environment and EEC services for broadcast by KGW.

41. provided information for articles on environmental education and the Environmental Education Center for Portland Public Schools, Oregon State Department of Education, and Portland State University newsletters and American Institute of Architects Journal, Synergy Access, Outdoor America, and Futures Conditional.

42. began negotiation with a local electronics manufacturing corporation for the donation of a computer graphics display terminal for demonstration and use in environmental simulations and games and for environmental information access at the EEC site.

43. began working with OMSI computer services to automate Environmental Education Center information files and to hook donated graphics display terminal to the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI) PDP 11.

44. met regularly with advisory groups such as Metro Environmental Education Council, Environmental Education Center Advisory Council, and State Advisory Board.

45. worked with others in environmental education on an on-going environmental education assessment process in the Tri-County area.

46. initiated evaluation procedures using graffiti booth, user interviews, written comments, etc.

## Purposes and Goals

The Environmental Education Center wishes to continue working toward the development and implementation of environmental education in the Pacific Northwest around self-learning and community involvement in the resolution of environmental problems. This project will:

1. focus citizen and student awareness on environmental problems and options.
2. emphasize self-learning processes in the development of skills and concepts necessary for effective participation in community environmental problem definition and solution.

3. promote citizen participation in efforts to maintain or improve environmental quality.
4. facilitate cooperation and communication among those concerned and active in environment and environmental education
5. facilitate more effective use of community resources.

Toward these goals, the project will

1. continue development of a prototype self-learning environmental center for community involvement where anyone may explore, study, and begin to work on areas of environmental concern most crucial to them. The center will combine the functions of a resource library, referral service, exhibition hall, learning laboratory, and participation center for learners, complete with the most advarced information accessing and communications systems available.
2. continue to identify, codify, and coordinate the use of existing resources. Inventories to determine, record, and share the source, condition, potential uses and availability of resources will be developed and conducted.
3. continue to identify where change would be beneficial or improved resource management could occur. Information concerning resources that are (a) duplicated elsewhere, (b) insufficient or inadequate to meet current and projected requests for use, and for (c) presently non-existent but needed to develop effective environmental education and action programs will be collected. This data serves as the basis for (a) initiation of action to remedy those conditions, or (b) when action is inappropraite, recommendations for improved resource management.
4. continue to identify and gain access into existing communications systems to facilitate improved resource utilization by network users.
5. continue to develop a communications system among key individuals controlling resources and the network's user where linkage system does not presently exist, or is inadequate to provide for effective utilization of resources.
6. continue development of community self-learning programs that emphasize and enhance individual and social action toward resolution of environmental concerns. These programs will aid learners in the exploration of environmental issues through using community resources and involvement in community projects. The program will encourage learners to identify societal/environmental problems, isolate basic issues and causes, to generate alternative courses of action, to prioritize these options, and to work toward implementation of the preferred solution and thus resolution of the problem.
7. continue and increase support and assistance to local groups throughout the Pacific Northwest that initiate and/or are pursuing development of similar environmental self-learning programs and activities within their community.
8. maintain, improve, expand feedback mechanisms among project advisory groups, environmental education task forces, resource agencies and organizations, and staff. New feedback formats will be explored and developed and tested.
9. provide for continuous project evaluation.
10. refine guidelines and suggestions describing how to initiate and establish community self-learning environmental programs and centers. Dissemination of these guidelines will be an on-going task of the project staff.

In attaining the above objectives, this project will affect the lives of countless Tri-County and Pacific Northwest residents, as groups and individuals who will be able to:

1. identify resources appropriate for environmental education.
2. communicate and cooperate with others in the resolution of environmental issues and problems.
3. initiate and practice self-learning.

All of the above imply an increase in community involvement in environmental education programs as well as environmental education increasingly based in local community problems, issues, and resources. Continued development of Environmental Education Center programs is essential to an increasingly coordinated effort toward comprehensive local and regional environmental education.

Action: 1974-5

The PERT chart and annotation following describe in detail the plan of action for achieving the above objectives. This action plan was designed especially for this project year with the assistance of Dr. George Ingebo and Dr. James Fenwick of the Portland Public Schools. In the annotation, the activity description, the staff member(s) responsible for it, the time duration or date of task completion are all listed. Evaluative criteria and numerical criteria for project success are also listed.

The approach diagrammed below is unique in its integration of several project aspects:

1. Use of existing resources and communication lines wherever possible as the basis for service.
2. User involvement. Community self-learning processes wil be included wherever possible into the development of this model. Students and volunteers, community and regional groups and agencies will be involved in the identification, description and evaluation of resources, in the development of participatory displays, in the development and maintenance of information services, in the identification and discussion of environmental and environmental education issues, and in problem-centered task forces.
3. Responsiveness to user needs. The EEC will continue to remain open to user-input in the guidance and development of EEC staff. Because EEC staff work continuously with users, user needs will be especially apparent.
4. Support of local initiative. The EEC will provide initial leadership and continuing support services in the development of information nets and communication links. EEC activities will encourage local leadership responsibility for regional and local development of environmental education policy and services.

Evaluation.

Project associate, Dr. Jorgensen, will be responsible for both "formative" and "summative" evaluation of the project. Summative evaluation will focus in two primary areas. The first, project management will describe the degree to which specified projectives have been attained and project management has been efficient. The second will focus on project elements of special interest such as project success with users of various experience levels,

# CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNITY CENTERS

There seems little doubt that before the turn of the Century an extensive multi-media communication network will have evolved in America. Such a network could give great benefits or pose great problems. It could evolve in such a way as to decrease or increase direct interaction among people. Will it humanize or dehumanize us? The answer lies in whether we as the users control the network or the network controls us.

The main hope lies in the establishment of a network of community centers throughout the land; a network easily available for people visitation and designed to encourage interaction with various communication networks and other centers. The centers would be attractive and designed to (1) stimulate social action and (2) provide access for involvement, including criticism of the network--feedback for constant readjustment in terms of the user. The centers would offer unity within diversity--that is, unified as to access to common information and diversified in terms of design and emphasis.

Having lived as a youth in rural villages, I can attest to the effectiveness of community centers as instruments of information exchange and involvement. Everyone in the community knew everyone else and each was in effect under conscious or unconscious surveillance most of the time. It was almost impossible to keep a secret!

People of all ages and kinds attended the meetings at the community center. It was entertaining and educational. The lines between recreation, education and research were refreshingly diffuse. The meetings probed those problems which the people felt needed to be confronted for the common good. Refreshment time was used to digest the meeting as well as the food, and to exchange information about people and events - including plenty of gossip!

This "people mix" approach to information was certainly humanistic, if not always humane. Yet there was such a close feeling within the community that even those least accepted were helped in times of hardship. The greatest rejection was usually reserved for strangers in town or those living in nearby towns, as they were viewed with real suspicion. Communication with strangers was deliberately obscured.

The problem in developing modern day community centers is one of retaining the good points of the good-old-days centers - the "people mix", the involvement aspects - while minimizing the weak points - the undue invasion of privacy and the rejection of other people.

Some ideas about centers to consider as we look to the future:

1. Focus on one neighborhood. Where the old rural center was located conveniently by a neighborhood already acquainted, the modern center often has the task of locating itself accessibly in a neighborhood and then helping it to become a community in spirit and function. Some difficulty may be encountered when getting started in a society where it is often assumed that big institutions are good institutions. A center can succeed, however, in spite of inaccessibility. For instance, the Environmental Education Center in Portland, Oregon, while located on the third floor of an old, unattractive building without an elevator and in an almost impossible parking area, is doing a thriving business.
2. Stimulate but don't take sides. It is quite proper and useful for a center to restrict itself to one point of view regarding the solution to problems. However, the center that seems most likely to be a community center in terms of people-mix - where the "other" people feel free to participate - is one that helps each participant with his or her own particular problems. In this light a center becomes

an idea brokerage house, a catalyst and a source of information, serving to stimulate people to participate in social improvement and help provide access for their efforts. The prime purpose is service to, not management of people. In this way, the staff is less apt to reach bureaucratic proportions.

3. Serve as a magnet. Most buildings in the old communities were austere, so the center didn't need to be especially attractive to compete. The modern community necessarily has many attractions. What it has little of is locations with the warmth of a home-like environment. For this reason it seems important to have carpeting, warm colors, plants, multi-levels and other aesthetic attractions which create an atmosphere for various people-mix functions. This need cost very little if the old barn-raising techniques are used, as will be pointed out later. The center environment should be so planned that the person walking in just feels good. Once in this frame of mind the many attractive options offered can take it from there.

4. Use an un-bureau approach. As Toffler has pointed out, we are moving from a bureaucratic society to one that proceeds by ad-hocracies. Hopefully the day when the park is organized for the convenience of the groundskeeper, the library for the convenience of the librarian and the school for the convenience of educators is about to end. A center might well avoid such bureaucratic trappery as a reception desk at the door, restrictive signs and monitoring activities. Programming the center environment to entice people to make choices on their own, with staff available for consultation when asked is preferable. Some features of the supermarket demonstrate this technique in the commercial world.

5. Unify education, recreation and research. If the spirit of the center is one of comfort, trust, variety, and even joy, the lines do tend to become obscured. For example, a laboratory area may have silhouettes of trees painted on the walls and a tree house to climb into. A study room can be equipped with multi-levels, pillows, aquaria and a library. A games and simulations room may itself be a simulation of a space ship with panel boards which people can manipulate to discover basic life support systems. Dignified? Perhaps not? Workable? Of course! And for people of all ages.

6. Users help maintain the systems. At one center there are self-learning displays that correlate wall maps of the surrounding area with information on rotary card files. In this case they are (1) environmental agencies, (2) school environmental projects, and (3) indoor and outdoor field trips. People feel free while self-learning at these files to correct data on the cards. One can flip through the files and see numerous changes made by the user. This helps keep the system accurate and responsive to the user. There are other ways to involve the user in center change such as graffiti booths where anyone can write anything. A mention should be made at this point about privacy. For example, before community resource helpers are listed it is important (1) to find out each person is willing to participate and (2) to assure that the lists will not be turned over to people who might misuse them - as mailing lists for advertising or the like.

7. Make each center somewhat unique. The old rural centers all looked and functioned about alike. They could, for it was a static world, there being little visitation among centers. It's a different ball game now. People travel often and far. They aren't apt to visit

centers like their own. Therefore it seems wise that each center be rather unique so people will drop in to see the difference and thereby make new contacts.

8. Unify centers by electronics. One way to diversify the offerings in a center is to have it interconnected with other centers by telephone, computer, videotape exchange and cable TV. This makes it possible for the user not only to tap the resources of the immediate community but the evolving world community. It would seem that ultimately there should be a center within about ten minutes travel, wherever a person is. If the system develops along the lines suggested in this article, the evolving world network will tend to arise from numerous grassroots systems. These will begin to intertie as they discover mutual advantages. This approach contrasts with the all too prevalent idea that some grand overall scheme should be divised and then dropped as a net over everyone "for their own good".

9. Build-it-yourself approach. It's a technique as old as the frontier barn-raising where people voluntarily got together to build needed structures. They almost had to use this technique in order to survive. Unfortunately in our age of specialization, this approach is becoming increasingly rare. It was my good fortune to be in on a barn-raising approach for a museum, a zoo and a center. It was exciting and the process created a clientele of users who felt that those institutions were "theirs". This is a natural approach for developing modern community centers. The process tends to develop the needed sense of community.

As we approach our bi-centennial year by not honor our past by emphasizing the development of community centers and town meetings and our future by pressing toward multi-media networking among these centers which is responsive to the individual?

Dr. Donald W. Stotler, Director
Environmental Education Center
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207

229-4682

OEG-073-5417

APPENDIX 3

FINAL REPORT - FY 72
October 18, 1973

Environmental Education Center
OEG-0-72-5

This grant assisted the Environmental Education Center in its second funding year.

A. Goals and Objectives

During the first funding year of the Environmental Education Center, the following goals of the EEC were developed. These are

1. STIMULATE ACTION
   --by helping people of all ages to know about environmental problems and the alternative solutions to them.
   --by helping to motivate people to Do something to alleviate these problems.
2. PROVIDE ACCESS
   --to information, agencies, organizations, people, resources, etc., that will assist people in their work concerning environmental issues.

During FY 72, staff and volunteers translated these goals into procedures, programs and projects. Besides development of the Environmental Education Center model, staff planned dissemination of the EEC model and the ideas and techniques behind the model throughout the Northwest.

Attachments A (How you may use the Environmental Education Center) and B (article from December, 1972, Science Education News) provide a description of the EEC's activity towards these goals.

Attatchment C, a planning worksheet developed in June, 1973, indicates some of the new events and and influences on EEC planning and future activity. The EEC hopes to maintain the flexibility and openess to the educational environmental influences which will allow it to respond to its users and remain an exciting, viable and useful service.

Attachment D, an introduction to FY 73 proposal for a Community Involvement/Self-Learning Center describes the end toward which the Environmental Education Center has been evolving. This description reflects many of the ideas which serve as the basis for Environmental Education Center development.

B. Design

The EEC is aimed as a service toward a very diverse audience including students from pre-school through college, community and environmental groups, state, county, and local government officials and educators, science and public interest researchers, architects, Boy Scouts, and business leaders. Because of this diversity in user groups groups, services are individualized and flexible.

The largest specific design difficulty was created during the first funding year. This difficulty is project location. The EEC depends on large visitor participation, but has been located on the third floor of an old university building with no parking facilities. Additional advertizing was necessary to encourage drop-in visitors, and the inconvenient location may have discouraged regular users.

The space design created and implemented during the previous funding year by volunteers has proved both durable, exciting, and flexible. Two additional rooms were added during the past year, a RESOURCE AREA and the WOMB ROOM. The Resource Area was designed and decorated by high school and architect volunteers. Students indexed, organized, and color-coded media resources for this room. The Womb Room was designed and decorated as class project by an interior design class at Portland State University. This room serves as small contemplation and study area.

The importance of good location and transportation will be recognized in future planning and possible site

C. Resources

Staff time was the major limitation on EEC activity. Paid staff for 72-73 were director, secretary, and two work-study students. During the past year, possibilities, ideas and prospects for EEC activity expanded beyond the limits of staff time and energy. Volunteers were used to extend staff efforts, but there were more volunteers available than staff had time to plan for.

Information resources developed by staff and volunteers included flexible files accessing community resources such as organizations, media, conferences, courses, field trips, and speakers. These files were developed by users and potential users consistant with the "self-learning" philosophy of the EEC. The resource room was considerably expanded with donated and free print information.

Area educators provided extensive volunteer consultation services. Materials and supplies in addition to that funded through OEG-0-72-5108 and OEG-0-72-5038 were provided by school, business, and private donations.

Attatchments E (SEK announcement) and F (January, 1973 bulletin) describe resources available through the EEC.

D. Coordination

In fulfilling its goals of stimulating action by groups and providing access to information, the EEC worked to develop communication and information-sharing among groups. Much of the EEC's work and information services was directed at communication and coordination among environmental education efforts in the Tri-county area, the State, and the Pacific Northwest. Staff served on numerous intergroup steering planning, and advisory committees. Center staff often served a catalyst or broker role in trying to connect the right resources with the right people. Providing a neutral ground for opposing groups, suggesting

large goals and cooperative activities consistant with all group goals were among the EEC's mode of work. A specific suggestion from EEC experience: invent a common task that is bigger than any one group. It's hard to involve groups by just suggesting cooperation - the medium for cooperation must be a large common task or vision.

E. Evaluation

Records have been kept on number of participants in EEC activities. Staff have collected user-response from the grafitti booth, from a push-button "Why did I come here?" box, from written letters of appreciation, from individual verbal responses and from advisory board meetings. Additional evaluation plans for FY 73-74 include keeping a detailed record of user-requests for information and EEC response. See attachment G for record summary sheet.

APPENDIX 4

## RECORDS BASED ON COMMUNITY USE OF EEC FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES

1973 1974

| | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May. | June | July |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Incoming phone calls | 284 | 398 | 323 | 225 | 572 | 234 | 448 | 441 | 502 | 416 | 327 | 336 | 230 |
| Visitors | 880 | 598 | 390 | 918 | 968 | 390 | 1,493 | 945 | 973 | 1,058 | 441 | 483 | 500 |
| Groups larger than 5 | 18 | 8 | 9 | 34 | 35 | 21 | 46 | 59 | 38 | 61 | 37 | 26 | 28 |
| Volunteer hours supervised EEC | 242 | 135 | 301 | 161 | 208 | 167 | 206 | 342 | 313 | 517 | 199 | 108 | 215 |
| Community-EEC cooperative leo projects initiated | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| requests for funding con- tration | 24 | 22 | 25 | 36 | 39 | 61 | 51 | 54 | 49 | 25 | 29 | 38 | 27 |

PLAYS

Environmental Education

ter

ay (Pat Kemper) of involvement of
in anti-litter programs
ays developed from Bucky Fuller's
tion Atrocean World
ption Self-Learning
ilmente (Dr. Pennington)
dex Do-it-yourself file on
ronmental Education Programs in
n Oregon
eale Dome
ative Energy Sources
unity Resource Exchange
cycling as related to bulk buying.
ect Jonah
e the Whale"
ldren's Art Exhibit
au of Neighborhood Environment
tary Display
(Pro & Con of Alternative Energy
ces)
er Mache Whale (4ft.)
rose Kindergarten

Dec. 073-5417

his document was processed for the ERIC Document Reproduction Service by
he ERIC Clearinghouse at Stanford. We are aware that some pages probably
ill not be readable in microfiche or in Hard Copy form. However,
his is the best available copy, and we feel that the document should not
e withheld from interested readers on the basis of these unreadable pages alone.